

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

IP 08-589 Musick Jail Master Plan Revision

ISS	SUES	S AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:	Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impac
1.	AE	STHETICS. Would the project:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
	b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
	c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
	d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
2.		RICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES. ould the project:				
	a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?				
	b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
	c.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
	d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.				\boxtimes
	e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use?	\boxtimes			
3.	AII	R QUALITY. Would the project:				
	a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes	
	b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			\boxtimes	

ISS	UES	AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:	Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
	d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes	
	e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				
4.		DLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the ject:				
	a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
	d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				\boxtimes
	e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
	f.	Conflict with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
5.		LTURAL/SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES. Would project:				
	a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				
	b.	Cause a substantial adverse changed in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				

ISS	ISSUES AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:			Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c.		indirectly destroy a unique gical resource or site or unique ature?				\boxtimes
	d.	d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					
6.	GE	OLOGY AN	D SOILS. Would the project:				
	a.	substantial	ple or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of , or death involving:				\boxtimes
		i.	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
		ii.	Strong seismic ground shaking?				\boxtimes
		iii.	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
		iv.	Landslides?				\boxtimes
	b.	Result in su topsoil?	abstantial soil erosion or the loss of			\boxtimes	
	c.	unstable, or result of the or off-site la	on a geologic unit or soil that is that would become unstable as a project, and potentially result in on-andslide, lateral spreading, liquefaction or collapse?				\boxtimes
	d.	Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?					\boxtimes
	e.	the use of swater dispo	incapable of adequately supporting eptic tanks or alternative waste sall system where sewers are not or the disposal of waste water?				\boxtimes
7.		GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:					
	a.	directly or i	reenhouse gas emissions, either indirectly, that may have a impact on the environment?		\boxtimes		
	b.	regulation a	th an applicable plan, policy or adopted for the purpose of reducing ns of greenhouse gases?		\boxtimes		
8.		ZARDS & H uld the proje	IAZARDOUS MATERIALS. ect:				
	a.	environmer	gnificant hazard to the public or the at through the routine transport, use, of hazardous materials?				\boxtimes
	b.	Create a sig	gnificant hazard to the public or the				\boxtimes

ISS	SUES	AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:	Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				
	c.	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
	d.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
	e.	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
	f.	For a project within the vicinity of private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
	g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
	h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
9.		DROLOGY & WATER QUALITY. Would project:				
	a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			\boxtimes	
	b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of the pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
	c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			\boxtimes	
	d.	Substantially alter drainage patterns of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in		\boxtimes		

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:		Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact	
		a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
	e.	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			\boxtimes	
	f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			\boxtimes	
	g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				\boxtimes
	h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
	i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
	j.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes
10.	LA	ND USE & PLANNING. Would the project:				
	a.	Physically divide an established community?				\boxtimes
	b.	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				\boxtimes
	c.	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				\boxtimes
11.	MI	NERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				\boxtimes
	b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				
12.	NO	ISE. Would the project result in:				
	a.	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				
	b.	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				\boxtimes
	c.	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				

ISSU	UES	AND SUPP	PORTING DATA SOURCES:	Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d.	ambient no	al temporary or periodic increase in ise levels in the project vicinity s existing without the project?			\boxtimes	
	e.	plan or, wh within two use airport, residing or	et located within an airport land use ere such plan has not been adopted, miles of a public airport or public would the project expose people working in the project area to oise levels?				
	f.	airstrip, wo residing or	ct within the vicinity of a private uld the project expose people working the project area to oise levels?				
		PULATION ject:	& HOUSING. Would the				
	a.	Induce subseither direct homes and	stantial population growth in an area, tly (for example, by proposing new businesses) or indirectly (for grough extension of roads or other tre)?				
	b.	housing, ne	bstantial numbers of existing reessitating the construction of thousing elsewhere?				
	c.		bstantial numbers of people, ag the construction of replacement ewhere?				\boxtimes
14.	PUBLIC SERVICES.						
	a.	physical im of new or p facilities, ne governmen which could impacts, in ratios, response	project result in substantial adverse pacts associated with the provision hysically altered governmental eed for new or physically altered tal facilities, the construction of d cause significant environmental order to maintain acceptable service onse times or other performance for any of the public services:			\boxtimes	
		i.	Fire protection?				
		ii.	Police protection?				\boxtimes
		iii.	Schools?				
		iv.	Parks?				
		V.	Other public facilities?			Ш	\boxtimes
15.		CREATION					
	a.	neighborho recreationa physical de	project increase the use of existing od and regional parks or other I facilities such that substantial terioration of the facility would accelerated?				
	b.	or require to	roject include recreational facilities he construction or expansion of I facilities which might have an ysical effect on the environment?				

ISSUES	S AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:	Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
	ANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the ject:				
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standard and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
d.	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?				\boxtimes
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				\boxtimes
	ILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the ject:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			\boxtimes	
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts?			\boxtimes	
c.	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?			\boxtimes	
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to			\boxtimes	

ISSUES AND SUPPORTING DATA SOURCES:			Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact/MM	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
		the provider's existing commitments?				
	f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			\boxtimes	
	g.	Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				
M	AND <i>A</i>	ATORY FINDINGS				
a.	qual habi wild leve com of a impo	s the project have the potential to degrade the ity of the environment, substantially reduce the tat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or life population to drop below self-sustaining ls, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal munity, reduce the number or restrict the range rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate ortant examples of the major periods of fornia history or prehistory?				
b.	limit ("Cu incre whe proje	s the project have impacts that are individually ted, but cumulatively considerable? Imulatively considerable means that the emental effects of a project are considerable in viewed in connection with the effects of past ects, the effects of other current projects, and the cets of probable future projects)?	\boxtimes			
c.	caus	s project have environmental effects which will e substantial adverse cause effects on human gs, either directly or indirectly?				
DE'	ΓERN	IINATION:				
		on the evidence in light of the whole record documer tions and attachments, I find that the proposed project		ched environment	al checklist expl	anation, cited
a.	and a	LD NOT have a significant effect on the environme negative declaration (ND) will be prepared pursuan A Guidelines Article 6, 15070 through 15075.				
b.	not be measu projec propo prepa	d have a significant effect on the environment, there is a significant effect in this case because the mitigation where have been added to the project or revisions in the thave been made by or agreed to by the project onent. A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) wired pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Article 6, 15070 gh 15075.	ion ne			
c.	not be	have a significant effect on the environment, which een analyzed previously. Therefore, an environment of report (EIR) is required.				
d.	enviro mitiga has be to app	have a "potentially significant effect on the onment" or "potentially significant effect unless ated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursolicable legal standards and 2) has been addressed by ation measures based on the earlier analysis as described.	suant y			

on the attached sheets. An Environmental Impact Report is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. .

- e) Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because potentially effects 1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or ND/MND pursuant to applicable legal standards and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR/ND/MND, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.
- f) Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because potentially effects 1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or ND/MND pursuant to applicable legal standards and 2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR/ND/MND, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project. However, minor additions and/or clarifications are needed to make the previous documentation adequate to cover the project which are documented in this Addendum to the earlier CEQA Document (Sec. 15164)

Signature:

Planner: Romi Archer

Dept: OC Communities Planning General Land Use Planning Division

Telephone: (949) 553-0666

NOTE: All referenced and/or incorporated documents may be reviewed by appointment only, at the County of Orange Public Works Department, 300 N. Flower Street, Santa Ana, California, unless otherwise specified. An appointment can be made by contacting the CEQA Contact Person identified above.

П

Revised 8/2/2011